REMARKS

This Amendment is in response to the Final Office Action dated August 23, 2006. In the Office Action, claims 1-29 and 31-40 were rejected. With this Amendment, claims 1, 3, 5-6, 10, 12-13, 15-18, 20-22, 25-26, 33 and 36-40 are amended. It is respectfully submitted that, claims 1-29 and 31-40 are in condition for allowance.

I. Interview Summary

Applicant's attorney would like to thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended during a telephone interview on September 19, 2006. During this interview, Applicant's attorney and the Examiner discussed the Bjorstrom et al. reference (US 6,594,348), the Buckley et al. reference (WO 03/083717) and the Chiu et al. reference (US 2002/0107888) in light of independent claims 1, 15, 22, 33 and 38. It is respectfully believed that the amendments made to clarify claim language in claims 1, 3, 5-6, 10, 12-13, 15-18, 20, 22, 25-26, 33 and 36-40 puts the present application in condition for allowance based on feedback from the Examiner during the telephone interview.

II. Claim Objections

Claims 1-14 were objected because of an informality. Accordingly, claim 1 is amended to overcome this informality.

III. § 103(a) Rejections

A. Claims 1-6, 15-16, 20-25, 27-28, 31, 33-34 and 37

Claims 1-6, 15-16, 20-25, 27-28, 31, 33-34 and 37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bjurstrom et al. (US 6,594,348) in view of Buckley et al.. (WO 03/083717). It is respectfully submitted that the combination of cited references fail to teach or suggest all of the claim elements in independent claims 1, 15, 22 and 33.

On page five of the Office Action, the Examiner states that Bjustrom et al. fails to disclose "controlling a shared display module to display the converted component in the

hypertext document." The Examiner, however, points to Buckley et al. as disclosing "a number of users using PDAs, each user having its own PDA, having the ability to control a display device in a shared display network."

In regards to independent claim 1, even if one were to combine the cited references, the combination of references fail to teach or suggest "controlling a shared display module to display the alternate component activation tag with the converted component in the hypertext document, wherein the shared display module is simultaneously viewable by a plurality of users" as claimed in claim 1. Bjurstrom et al. discloses associating elements of a HTML page to DMTF tones and implementing a function on a HTML page in response to receiving a DMTF tones (see col. 5, line 54 to col. 9, line 67). As seemingly indicated by the Examiner in both the telephone interview and the Office Action, Bjurstrom et al. fails to disclose a shared display module viewable by a plurality of users let alone the control of a shared display module viewable by a plurality of users to display the alternate component activation tag with the converted component in the hypertext document. Buckley et al. discloses a shared display environment in which users of personal browsers push and pull viewable pages from the shared display (see page 3, line 13 through page 5, line 26). However, Buckley et al. fails to disclose the control of a shared display module, which is viewable by a plurality of users, to display the alternate component activation tag in a hypertext document. In fact, col. 5, lines 13-14 states that the shared display of Buckley et al. does not include clickable links. Therefore, the Buckley et al. reference actually teaches away from activating a converted component in the hypertext document that is simultaneously viewable by a plurality of users. It is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is allowable over the cited references as well as claims 2-6 that depend therefrom.

In regards to independent claim 15, even if one were to combine the cited references, the combination of references fails to teach or suggest "controlling a shared display module to display the alternate browsing activation tags with the modified plurality of browsing modes, wherein the shared display module is simultaneously viewable by a plurality of users." Similar to the discussion described above in regards to claim 1, Bjurstrom et al. fails to disclose a shared display environment let alone the control of a shared display module to display the alternate

browsing activation tags with the associated modified plurality of browsing modes to a plurality of users, and although Buckley et al. discloses a shared display environment in which users of personal browsers push and pull viewable pages from the shared display, Buckley et al. fails to disclose the control of a shared display module to display the alternate browsing activation tags with the associated modified plurality of browsing modes to a plurality of users. It is respectfully submitted that claim 15 is allowable over the cited references as well as claims 16, 20 and 21 that depend therefrom.

In regards to independent claim 22, even if one were to combine the cited references, the combination of references fail to teach or suggest "a hypertext display controller configured to instruct a shared display module to display the alternate component activation tag with the converted component in the hypertext document, wherein the shared display module is viewable by a plurality of users" as claimed in claim 22. Similar to the discussions described above in regards to claims 1 and 15, Bjurstrom et al. fails to disclose a shared display environment let alone a hypertext display controller configured to display the alternative component activation tag with the converted component in the hypertext document to a plurality of users, and although Buckley et al. discloses a shared display environment in which users of personal browsers push and pull viewable pages from the shared display, Buckley et al. fails to disclose a hypertext display controller configured to display the alternate component activation tag with the converted component in the hypertext document to a plurality of users. It is respectfully submitted that claim 22 is allowable over the cited references as well as claims 23-25, 27-28 and 31 that depend therefrom.

In regards to independent claim 33, even if one were to combine the cited references, the combination of references fail to teach or suggest "a hypertext display controller configured to display the plurality of browsing modes and alternate browsing activation tags on a shared display module, wherein the shared display module is viewable by a plurality of users" as claimed in claim 33. As previously discussed, in regards to claims 1, 15 and 22, Bjurstrom et al. fails to disclose a shared display environment let alone a hypertext display controller configured to display the plurality of browsing modes and alternate browsing activation tags on a shared

display module viewable by a plurality of users, and although Buckley et al. discloses a shared display environment in which users of personal browsers push and pull viewable pages from the shared display, Buckley et al. fails to disclose a hypertext display controller configured to display the plurality of browsing modes and alternate browsing activation tags on a shared display module viewable to a plurality of users. It is respectfully submitted that claim 33 is allowable over the cited references as well as claims 34 and 37 that depend therefrom.

B. Claims 7 and 9

Claims 7 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bjurstrom et al. in view of Buckley et al. and further in view of Lai et al. (US 6,912,326). It is respectfully submitted that claims 7 and 9 are in condition for allowance at least based on their dependency on allowable claim 1.

C. Claim 8

Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bjurstrom et al. in view of Buckley et al., further in view of Lai et al. and further in view of Sotomayor (US 5,708,825). It is respectfully submitted that claim 8 is in condition for allowance at least based on its dependency on allowable claim 1.

D. Claims 10-13, 17-19, 29 and 35-36

Claims 10-13, 17-19, 29 and 35-36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bjurstrom et al. in view of Buckley et al. and further in view of Borman et al. (US 6,226,955). It is respectfully submitted that claims 10-13, 17-19, 29 and 35-36 are in condition for allowance at least based on their dependency on allowable claims 1, 15, 22 and 33.

However, these dependent claims are allowable for additional reasons. For example, the cited references fail to teach or suggest "controlling the shared display module to display the automated browsing modes and automated browsing activation tags to the plurality of users" as claimed in claim 10 and "controlling the shared display module to display the automated

browsing modes and automated browsing activation tags to the plurality of users" as claimed in claim 17.

E. Claim 26

Claim 26 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bjurstrom et al. in view of Buckley et al. and further in view of Tanenbaum. It is respectfully submitted that claim 26 is in condition for allowance at least based on its dependency on allowable claim 22.

However, dependent claim 26 is allowable for additional reasons. For example, the cited references fail to teach or suggest that "the input processor is further configured to process different types of input signals received from the portable input devices operated by each user in an order" as claimed in claim 26.

F. Claim 32

Claim 32 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bjurstrom et al. in view of Buckley et al. and further in view of Giacalone, Jr. (US 2001/0052000). It is respectfully submitted that claim 32 is in condition for allowance at least based on its dependency on allowable claim 22.

G. Claims 38-39

Claims 38-39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bjurstrom et al. in view of Buckley et al. and further in view of Chiu et al. (US 2002/0107888). It is respectfully submitted that the combination of cited references fail to teach or suggest all of the claim elements in independent claim 38.

On page twenty of the Office Action, the Examiner states that Bjustrom et al. fails to disclose "controlling a shared display module to display the converted component in a shared display environment." The Examiner points to Buckley et al. as disclosing "a number of users using PDAs, each user having its own PDA, having the ability to control a display device in a shared display network." The Examiner further states that Bjurstrom et al. and Buckley et al. fail

to specifically disclose "a display module to display the symbol of the converted component." The Examiner points to Chiu et al. as disclosing the ability to "display a web page with hyperlinks displaying corresponding numbers, which are symbols, next to the hyperlink so the user can operate function key using numeric key to access links."

Even if one were to combine the cited references, the combination of references fail to teach or suggest "controlling a shared display module to display the symbol representing the converted component, wherein the shared display is viewable by a plurality of users" as claimed in claim 1. Bjurstrom et al. discloses associating elements of a HTML page to DMTF tones and implementing a function on a HTML page in response to receiving a DMTF tones. As seemingly indicated by the Examiner in both the telephone interview and the Office Action, Bjurstrom et al. fails to disclose a shared display module viewable by a plurality of users let alone the control of a shared display module viewable by a plurality of users to display a symbol representing the converted component. Buckley et al. discloses a shared display environment in which users of personal browsers push and pull viewable pages from the shared display. However, Buckley et al. fails to disclose the control of a shared display module, which is viewable by a plurality of users, to display the symbol representing the converted component. In fact, col. 5, lines 13-14 states that the shared display of Buckley et al. does not include clickable links. Therefore, the Buckley et al. reference actually teaches away from activating a converted component that is simultaneously viewable by a plurality of users. Although Chiu et al. discloses displaying symbols next to hyperlinks so that user can operate the hyperlink by using a numeric key, Chiu et al. does not disclose the control of a shared display module, which viewable by a plurality of users, to display the symbol representing the converted component or activating that converted component upon receipt of an input signal from a portable device by one of the plurality of users. It is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is allowable over the cited references as well as claim 39 that depends therefrom.

H. Claim 40

Claim 40 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bjurstrom et al. in view of Buckley et al. and further in view of Chiu et al. and further in view of Borman et al. It is respectfully submitted that claim is in condition for allowance at least based on its dependency on allowable claim 38. However, claim 40 is allowable for additional reasons. For example, the cited references fail to teach or suggest "controlling the display module to display the plurality of automated browsing modes and automated browsing activation tags to the plurality of users in the shared display environment."

For the reasons stated above, it is respectfully submitted that all pending claims 1-29 and 31-40 are in condition for allowance. Favorable action is respectfully requested.

The Director is authorized to charge any fee deficiency required by this paper or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTMAN, CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A.

By: /Leanne R. Taveggia/

Leanne R. Taveggia, Reg. No. 53,675
900 Second Avenue South – Suite 1400
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-3319
Phone: (612) 334-3222 Fax: (612) 334-3312

LRT/jme